

and the young. The Senate and House welfare bills do not meet this test.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1995]

#### THE WELFARE FADE

Now President Clinton has walked away from the welfare bill he sent to Congress last year, just as the week before he renounced the tax increase he pushed to passage in 1993. What next? Perhaps he'll say he didn't mean to send up last year's health care reform proposals either. Mrs. Clinton made him do it. It becomes increasingly difficult to know what this president stands for, or whether he stands for anything.

Mr. Clinton telephoned the columnist and author Ben Wattenberg last week. Mr. Wattenberg is a conservative Democrat who thinks the party has drifted too far from majority values to which it ought to return. Among much else, he thought the welfare plan the president submitted last summer was too weak—and guess what? The president agreed with him. Mr. Wattenberg wrote in a column that Mr. Clinton told him, "I wasn't pleased with it either."

The White House went to its familiar battle stations. The president, after all, wouldn't want the many people in and out of the administration who helped formulate the plan, to say nothing of the many in Congress whom he had urged to support it, to think he was abandoning them. His spokespeople therefore once again had to scurry to explain what it was that he had really meant. What he had really meant was that the budget made him do it, his press secretary said. For lack of child-care money, he hadn't been able to draw up a plan to force as many mothers off the rolls as he would have liked. But that's not what really happened. It's a misleading and self-serving, not to say self-deluding, account of the history of this bill, as fictional as was the president's account of the history of the tax increase.

Campaigning in 1992, Mr. Clinton suggested that he would force people off the welfare rolls after two years; that was the top of the message, which people heard. It was followed by all kinds of footnotes saying he would force them off only under certain conditions. The government, as part of the process of moving them off the rolls, would offer increased support in the form of training, an extension of their Medicaid, child care—even a job itself, if necessary. The families would be off "welfare," but government spending on their behalf would meanwhile go up, not down. That's how it has to be, of course, but in the campaign, that not-so-popular part of the message was played down. One still could have hoped and even believed he meant it, of course.

In office, the task of marrying the slogan to the footnotes fell mainly to the Department of Health and Human Services. The secretary hired some of the best people in the country to do the work. They did it well. Last summer the president loved it, or seemed to. "If we do the things we propose in this welfare reform program, even by the most conservative estimates, these changes together will move one million adults who would otherwise be on welfare into work or off welfare altogether by the year 2000," he said in announcing its submission.

But the president's plan was swept aside by Republican and other congressional conservatives who pocketed his proposal for time-limited welfare and went beyond it. Mr. Clinton started and in a sense legitimized a process that he then lacked the votes and stature to stop. No action was taken on welfare last year; this year, with Republicans in command of both houses, the House and Senate have passed much tougher bills than Mr. Clinton proposed.

Both are bad by the standards the president enunciated last year. They are punitive, would pull the federal floor out from under welfare, could lead to the breakup of the food stamp program as well, and would likely end up stranding some of the most vulnerable people in the society. Most of those are children. The president has nonetheless climbed aboard and said he would sign the Senate version. Now here is the part you need especially to know: *Mr. Clinton's own advisers have told him that it would likely consign as many as a million more children to poverty, and it would provide several billions less for child care than his own proposal of a year ago.* But, well, it's better than the House bill, and surely you couldn't ask a president who promised to end welfare as we know it to begin the election year by vetoing a welfare reform bill that he himself did so much to beget.

Mr. Clinton could have fought for the right result on welfare. He knows the issues by heart; he has the power; and when he still had the courage to voice them, he had the better arguments. What he has done instead is acquiesce for political reasons in the wrong result—and then give false reasons for the acquiescence. He thinks he gains by such behavior, but he diminishes himself. ●

#### FLAG-DESECRATION AMENDMENT COULD MAKE MATTERS FAR WORSE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, George Anastaplo, who teaches law at the Loyola University of Chicago, is a long-time battler for first amendment rights. Recently, he had an item in the Chicago Sun-Times about the flag amendment to the Constitution that we will be confronting before too long.

One of the points he mentions is that the amendment in the Constitution would elevate the flag above the Constitution. It does strike me as ironic that flag desecration would be enshrined in the Constitution, while if you burn the Constitution, nothing happens. Should we then have another amendment for that? And perhaps another amendment for anyone who would burn the Bible? Where does this stop?

I also have noted flags made into shirts and even pants. I confess, I find this offensive, but I don't think we need to amend the Constitution because of offensive conduct.

I ask that the George Anastaplo item be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 11, 1995]

#### FLAG-DESECRATION AMENDMENT COULD MAKE MATTERS FAR WORSE

(By George Anastaplo)

The occasional flag-burning display permitted during the last decade by the U.S. Supreme Court is generally offensive. But the proposed constitutional amendment authorizing the government to punish physical abuse or desecration of the flag may make matters far worse, however patriotic the motives of the amendment's sponsors.

One implication of such an amendment is that all other forms of desecration in this country would be thereafter considered beyond government supervision. Also, the flag would be elevated above the Constitution, even though that document alone is granted special status in the Constitution. (Every federal and state officer of government in

this country is required to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.)

A likely effect of legislation grounded in the proposed flag-desecration amendment would be to increase the number of publicized flag-burnings in this country. Those impassioned flag-burners who want to provoke the authorities to act against them are protected, and in effect discouraged, these days by Supreme Court rulings.

Routine abuses of the flag will continue, no matter what the Constitution and laws happen to say. Most of these abuses, keyed to commercial exploitation, have always been ignored by a public that is aroused only by those abuses that take the form of hostile flag burnings. Highly selective official enforcement of flag-desecration laws, even if a constitutional amendment should be ratified, would continue to raise First Amendment issues.

The proposed flag-desecration amendment is but the latest of a series of exercises in constitutional frivolity that have diverted recent Congresses. ●

#### OUTREACH TO THE SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS COMMUNITY

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, on September 21, 1995, I hosted a procurement fair, along with the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, that I hope will help open up the economic activities of the Federal Government and private sector to small and disadvantaged businesses and entrepreneurs. I was extremely pleased to see nearly 80 Federal agencies and private corporations participate as exhibitors in the fair, providing hundreds of small business owners an opportunity to understand the rules governing Federal and private contracting, as well as how and where to look for contracting opportunities. This fair, modeled on an old-fashioned trade fair, will help bridge the gap that has existed between the small and disadvantaged business community and key procurement staff within the government and private sector.

The Department of Health and Human Services was one of many Federal agencies who shared important procurement information at the fair. I thank them for their participation and commend the Department of Health and Human Services on their active efforts to reach out to small, disadvantaged, and women-owned businesses.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of remarks by Mr. John Callahan, Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget at the Department of Health and Human Services, be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. CALLAHAN

Honored Participants and Members of the Caucus:

Good Morning, I am John J. Callahan, Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Health and Human Services. I bring you greetings and well wishes from Secretary Shalala and Deputy Secretary Walter Broadnax for a most successful gathering. They would like to commend Senator Carol Moseley-Braun for her efforts in putting together this Federal Procurement Fair and Congressman Donald Payne as Chairman of